



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,229	07/11/2003	Young-Chan Kim	1293.1854	2343
21171	7590	12/10/2007	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			RAHMJOO, MANUCHER	
SUITE 700			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			2624	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/617,229	KIM, YOUNG-CHAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Rahmjoo	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/29/07. 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1- 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As per claim 11 applicant recites "a signal inputting unit receiving an R,G,B video signals from a host computer". Paragraph [0021] recites "referring to FIG. 1, a signal inputting unit 110 receives R,G,B signals and a vertical/horizontal signal from a host(not shown)" and [0028] recites only a host absent any description what this "host" is. Therefore, the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1- 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al (US Patent 5,644,325), hereinafter, King in view of Yamakawa et al (US Patent 5,809,366), hereinafter, Yamakawa.

As per claims 1, 4- 5, 7, 11- 12, 14 and 16 and as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, King teaches receiving RGB signals from a host (col. 16 line 55 corresponding to host) see for example figures 10- 11;

selecting one of an R, a G, or a B component of the RGB signal (see for example col. 3 lines 23- 27 for the selection of color blue and claims 2 and 3 wherein level select circuit controls the level of each R or G or B independently to control a color mixture) including the video signal as a selected one R,G, or B component see for example column 5 lines 38- 40 and setting a region (color key range) of the selected one R,G, or B signal as a checked region which is checked see for example column 7 line 25.

However King does not teach detecting a minimum pixel level value in the checked region; comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value to determine whether an abnormal

one R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host; displaying on a screen a message indicator indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host; and signal input unit receiving RGB signals, a horizontal and vertical synchronization signal; and a storage unit storing the minimum pixel level value detected in the particular region of the selected one R,G, or B component.

Yamakawa teaches detecting a minimum pixel level value (determining the exact colors defining the point corresponding detecting minimum pixel level value to the colors of these points as said colors deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range wherein said deviation may assume any values in the minimum range and or maximum range see col. 14 lines 27- 30) in the checked region see for example column 14 lines 27- 31 for points deviated by more than an allowable range corresponding to the detecting a minimum pixel level;

comparing the minimum pixel level value for the selected one R,G, or B component with a predetermined threshold value (previous RGB data or allowable range) to determine whether an abnormal one R,G, or B component is present, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host see for example column 14 lines 35- 38 wherein RGB data is compared with previous RGB data and correction is based on the results of comparison;

displaying on a screen a message indicator (corresponding to displaying a warning) indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component includes a video signal abnormally input due to the malfunction of the host see for example column 14 lines 27- 35 through displaying a warning (a flag generated by the color calibration system) due to deviation by more than an allowable range OR improper reading of data;

signal input unit receiving R,G,B signals, a horizontal and vertical synchronization signal see for example figures 3- 5 for the color calibration system corresponding to the input unit for receiving R,G,B signals;

a storage unit storing the minimum pixel level value detected in the selected one R,G, or B component see for example the color calibration system of figures 4- 5 corresponding to the storage unit.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Yamakawa into King to perform minimum pixel level detection and comparison with a predetermined threshold value and thereafter displaying of a screen message as to provide a color balance selection method which allows a user to select the color balance relative to the calibrated standard of an image processing device and therefore reproduce colors contained in a specific image chosen by a user and thereby offer an efficient and user friendly device see for example column 2 lines 7-23.

As per claims 2 and 9 Yamakawa teaches setting a flag (warning) which indicates whether the selected one R,G, or B component is abnormal when the

minimum pixel level value is smaller (deviation by more than an allowable range) than a predetermined threshold value see for example column 14 line 32, and resetting (execute scanning again or repeat the process) the flag when the minimum pixel level value is larger (deviation by more than an allowable range) than the predetermined threshold value see for example column 14 lines 32- 33.

As per claim 3 and 10 Yamakawa teaches checking whether a flag indicating whether the selected one R,G, or B component is abnormal is set see for example figure 17 for the loop in the flow chart regarding the display warning block 494; checking if a video signal checking function is enabled when the flag is set see for example figure 17 (block 490) for the flow chart regarding color determination (checking) of the colors of the printed frames; and inherently teaches setting how long the message will be displayed and how long a predetermined warning message is displayed, when enabling of the video signal checking function is confirmed see for example column 14 lines 41- 46 through the clock of the color calibration system which reduces the time (time setting for displaying a message) needed to perform the color balance adjustment along with reducing a load imposed on the processing system.

As per claims 6 and 15 and as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner Yamakawa teaches the controller generates an on-screen-display (OSD) signal (displaying a warning) that enables and disables (the flow chart of figure 17) an R,G,B signal checking function.

As per claim 8 and in view of the rejection of the independent claims Yamakawa teaches extracting a minimum pixel level value when the pixel level value in the

selected one R,G, or B component is smaller than the predetermined value see for example figure 21 and column 14 lines 27- 30 for points 530- 533 when there is deviation more than a allowable range.

As per claim 13 and in view of the rejection of the independent claims Yamakawa teaches a comparator (color calibration system) comparing the minimum pixel level value in the selected one R,G, or B component with a minimum pixel level value detected in a previous signal (see for example column 14 line 36 fro comparing R,G,B data with previous R,G,B data), and extracts a minimum pixel level value see for example column 14 lines 30- 31 for improper reading or inputting due to deviation by more than an allowable range.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's remarks on page 7 wherein applicant points out the subject matter of host in paragraph [0003], examiner believes it is [0005] and that it is a tying error. However, examiner fails to see any adequate description of "host computer" and therefore the rejection remains.

As per applicant's remarks on page 9 wherein applicant recites "applicant asserted in the Office Action filed August 9, 2007 that Yamakawa fails to suggest or

disclose, either in the above-recited text or elsewhere, the abnormal R,G, or B component being a component abnormally input due to malfunction of the host" and "the current Office Action at page 10 merely states that the above-recited claim language is suggested by Yamakawa making a determination based on whether the colors of these points *deviate the expected result by more than an allowable range*" and "Yamakawa is directed to the operation of a stand- alone scanner".

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner points out that in light of prior rejection, said malfunction as claimed and said deviation as disclosed by Yamakawa are broadly interpreted as equivalent. Merriam Webster Online dictionary defines deviation as " noticeable or marked departure from accepted norms of behavior". Said malfunction as claimed is divergent from accepted behavior or norms. Therefore, as per definition provided examiner points out to clear correspondence of what is claimed Vs. the teachings of Yamakawa in the rejected portion made of the record therein. The display device of the current application for patent is also viewed as a stand- alone device and applicant does not claim otherwise.

As per applicant's remarks on page 9 wherein applicant recites "Yamakawa fails to link the deviation to the selected one R,G, or B component" and "Yamakawa fails to suggest or disclose displaying on screen message...".

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner points out to said paragraph made of the record used for rejection which recites "the points 530, 531, 532 and 533 (corresponding to the color data

containing RGB information) illustrated in FIG. 21 are **analyzed** (corresponding to comparing) in order to determine the exact colors defining the point. When the colors of these points deviate (broadly corresponding to malfunction) the expected result by more than an allowable range, it can be determined that the image data was not properly read or input (broadly corresponding to the abnormality) and a **warning** (broadly corresponding to message indication) for urging the user to execute the scanning again or repeat the process **can be displayed (corresponding to the display of message)**. When the image data at the paint portions on the frame is properly read or input, the RGB data is smoothed by the RGB filter 6. Next, since *this RGB data is compared with the previous RGB data* and the parameters of the CMYK gamma. correction unit 12 are corrected based on the result of the comparison, the color balance is adjusted to accurately reproduce the colors at the desired points selected by the user", which is a one to one mapping of applicant's claim.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 6744917 teaches a color space detector (30) for recognizing a color space of a digital video input includes a high frequency detector (32) that identifies a presence of either blue data or possible color difference data in color information carried in the digital video input (corresponding to comparing of RGB input color data). A data sample correlator (34) is also used to identify a presence of either blue data or color difference data in the color information. Other detectors (36) provide an indication as to the type of color space present on the digital video input. A determinator receives and analyzes (corresponding to comparing of RGB color data) the results from the high frequency detector (32), the data sample correlator (34), and the other detectors (36) and generates a control signal in response to these results. The control signal indicates (corresponding to message) that the color information includes one of red/green/blue data, YCrCb data, or indeterminate data. The color space detector of claim 11, wherein the high frequency detector comprises: a decimator operable to reject every other sample of the color information; a box filter operable to replicate non-rejected color information, the box filter operable to insert the replicated non-rejected color information in place of the rejected color information; a bandpass filter operable to pass the non-rejected and replicated color information in a selected frequency range; and a threshold comparator (comparing to a threshold) operable to compare the passed color information (e.g., input RGB data) to a threshold value, the threshold comparator operable to generate a result indicating (e.g., message indicator) a presence of red/green/blue data in the color information in response to the passed color information exceeding the threshold value.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is 571-272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM- 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Rahmjoo



December 01, 2007